



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 09/521,176 | 03/08/2000 | Toshiro Ozawa | SONYJP-3.0-106 | 1408 |
| 530 | 7590 | 12/01/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG; KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090 | | | SALTARELLI, DOMINIC D | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2611 | |

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/521,176

Applicant(s)

OZAWA, TOSHIRO

Examiner

Dominic D Saltarelli

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-13,15-23,25-32 and 34-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-13, 15-23,25-32, and 34-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/11/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The disclosure fails to support including "a predetermined expression in the distribution request e-mail message to indicate that the user request is being transmitted" as now recited in claim 3. This newly added limitation appears to be new matter and should be cancelled from the claim.

3. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2611

The disclosure fails to support including "a predetermined expression to indicate that the user request is being transmitted" as now recited in claim 13. This newly added limitation appears to be new matter and should be cancelled from the claim.

4. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The disclosure fails to support including "a predetermined expression that indicates that the user request is being transmitted" as now recited in claim 23. This newly added limitation appears to be new matter and should be cancelled from the claim.

5. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The disclosure fails to support including "a predetermined expression in the distribution request e-mail message to indicate that the user request is being sent" as

Art Unit: 2611

now recited in claim 32. This newly added limitation appears to be new matter and should be cancelled from the claim.

6. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The disclosure fails to support "the distribution request e-mail message includes a predetermined expression to indicate that the user request is being sent" as now recited in claim 32. This newly added limitation appears to be new matter and should be cancelled from the claim.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 3, 13, 23, 32, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 3, 13, 23, 32, and 38 are vague because an expression indicating that an email is being sent cannot be included into the very e-mail which is being sent. Any information included in an email by the sender must be included before the email is

Art Unit: 2611

sent, and it is a contradiction to include information which indicates that an email is being sent prior to the email being sent.

9. Claim 36 recites the limitation "the answer e-mail message" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al. (5,721,829, of record) [Dunn] in view of Abecassis (US 2001/0041053, of record) and Sartain et al. (5,914,712, of record) [Sartain].

Regarding claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 37, Dunn discloses a program distribution system and method (fig. 1, col. 2, lines 40-44) comprising:

A receiver (fig. 1, STB 26); and

A transmitter (fig. 1, headend 20);

Said receiver being operable to accept a user request for a desired program (col. 5, lines 24-31);

Said transmitter including a distributable program storing unit (fig. 1, program storage 42) operable to store a plurality of distributable programs (col. 3,

Art Unit: 2611

lines 46-51), a distribution controller (fig. 1, media server 40) operable to receive the distribution request (STB message, col. 5, lines 29-34), read out the requested program from said distributable program storing unit and distribute said program from a distributor to said receiver (col. 5, lines 24-41).

Dunn fails to disclose the user request is in a free style text format and converting the user request into a distribution request e-mail message that includes the user request, which is send to the transmitter, wherein said transmitter receives the request e-mail message and determines whether the requested program is one of the stored plurality of programs and sending the program when the requested program is one of the stored plurality of distributable programs.

In an analogous art, Abecassis teaches a video on demand service (paragraph 179) wherein users access programs using requests that comprise keyword searching and retrieval (users type in search terms in a free form style, paragraph 315), which involves comparing a word within a distribution request with stored descriptions of programs and reading out the selected program if one of the stored the descriptions corresponds to said word. A keyword search allows users to quickly find a desired distributable program.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system, method, and transmitter of Dunn to include free style text user requests, where the system determines whether the requested program is one of the stored plurality of programs based on the users request, as taught

Art Unit: 2611

by Abecassis. The reason for doing so is to allow users to quickly find a desired program without linearly incrementing their way through a list.

In an analogous art, Sartain teaches a video on demand system (col. 2, lines 38-48) wherein distribution requests are made via e-mail (col. 10, lines 15-20), for the advantage of utilizing the internet for distribution requests.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system, method, and transmitter disclosed by Dunn and Abecassis to include converting a distribution request into an e-mail, as disclosed by Sartain, for the advantage of utilizing the internet for distribution requests, a commonly utilized backchannel for television distribution systems.

12. Claims 2, 12, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn, Abecassis and Sartain as applied to claims 1, 11, and 21 above, and further in view of Yurt et al. (5,550,863, of record) [Yurt].

Regarding claims 2, 12, and 22, Dunn, Abecassis, and Sartain disclose the system, method, and transmitter of claims 1, 11, and 21, but fail to disclose the distributable program storing unit stores an associated title for each of the said plurality of distributable programs which is used for selecting a program.

In an analogous art, Yurt teaches a video on demand service (col. 2, lines 48-59) wherein item names are used to identify items (col. 10, lines 52-56), as item names are easier to remember, making user access to these items more intuitive.

Art Unit: 2611

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system, method, and transmitter disclosed by Dunn, Abecassis, and Sartain to include the program's title, as taught by Yurt, wherein words in the user's request would then be compared to the titles associated with stored programs, for the advantage of making the search for a distributable program more intuitive and user friendly.

13. Claims 5, 7, 15, 17, 25, and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn, Abecassis, and Sartain as applied to claims 1, 11, and 21 above, and further in view of Yurt and Venkatraman et al. (6,477,647) [Venkatraman].

Regarding claims 5, 15, and 25, Dunn, Abecassis, and Sartain disclose the system, method, and transmitter of claims 1, 11, and 21, but fail to disclose said distribution controller is further operable to transmit an answer e-mail message to said receiver in response to the distribution request e-mail message, the answer e-mail message including a notice of correspondence when the user request includes a title associated with one of the stored plurality of programs.

In an analogous art, Yurt teaches a video on demand service (col. 2, lines 48-59) wherein item names are used to identify items (col. 10, lines 52-56), as item names are easier to remember, making user access to these items more intuitive.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system, method, and transmitter disclosed by Dunn, Abecassis,

Art Unit: 2611

and Sartain to include the program's title, as taught by Yurt, the program title being the in the user request, for the advantage of making the search and request for a distributable program more intuitive and user friendly.

In an analogous art, Venkatraman teaches the transmission of confirmation e-mails to users, confirming the selections made by users when interacting with a remote computer system (col. 6, lines 8-57), providing users with the opportunity to confirm selections made to reduce the chance of unwanted selections and providing users with the chance to revoke a selection.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system, method, and transmitter disclosed by Dunn, Abecassis, Sartain, and Yurt to include confirmation e-mails in response to user selections, as taught by Venkatraman, (when the title is one of the stored plurality of titles, as the correspondence is a selection confirmation) for the benefit of reducing the chance of unwanted program title selections and providing users with the chance to revoke a program title selection.

Regarding claims 7, 17, and 27, Yurt additionally discloses user confirmation of a purchase (fig. 3, step 3100, col. 14, lines 6-12) in response to a system-generated confirmation prompt (col. 13 line 55 – col. 14 line 12) to fully insure that a user selection is correct (col. 14, lines 2-5).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the system, method, and transmitter disclosed by Dunn,

Abecassis, Sartain, Yurt, and Venkatraman to include transmitting a user confirmation of a user selection in response to a system-generated confirmation prompt, as taught by Yurt, wherein the confirmation would take the form of an e-mail response, as this is the established means by which the transmitter and receiver communicate, for the benefit of fully insuring that a user requested program title has been correctly selected.

14. Claims 6, 8, 16, 18, 26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn, Abecassis, Sartain, and Yurt as applied to claims 2, 12, and 22 above, and further in view of Venkatraman.

Regarding claims 6, 16, and 26, Dunn, Abecassis, Sartain, and Yurt disclose the system, method, and transmitter of claims 2, 12, and 22, but fail to disclose said distribution controller is further operable to transmit an answer e-mail message to said receiver in response to the distribution request e-mail message, the answer e-mail message including a notice of correspondence when the user request includes a title associated with one of the stored plurality of programs.

In an analogous art, Venkatraman teaches the transmission of confirmation e-mails to users, confirming the selections made by users when interacting with a remote computer system (col. 6, lines 8-57), providing users with the opportunity to confirm selections made to reduce the chance of unwanted selections and providing users with the chance to revoke a selection.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system, method, and transmitter disclosed by Dunn, Abecassis, Sartain, and Yurt to include confirmation e-mails in response to user selections, as taught by Venkatraman, (when the title is one of the stored plurality of titles, as the correspondence is a selection confirmation) for the benefit of reducing the chance of unwanted program title selections and providing users with the chance to revoke a program title selection.

Regarding claims 8, 18, and 28, Yurt additionally discloses user confirmation of a purchase (fig. 3, step 3100, col. 14, lines 6-12) in response to a system-generated confirmation prompt (col. 13 line 55 – col. 14 line 12) to fully insure that a user selection is correct (col. 14, lines 2-5).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the system, method, and transmitter disclosed by Dunn, Abecassis, Sartain, Yurt, and Venkatraman to include transmitting a user confirmation of a user selection in response to a system-generated confirmation prompt, as taught by Yurt, wherein the confirmation would take that form of an e-mail response, as this is the established means by which the transmitter and receiver communicate, for the benefit of fully insuring that a user requested program title has been correctly selected.

Art Unit: 2611

15. Claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 29, 30, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn, Abecassis, Sartain, Yurt, and Venkatraman as applied to claims, 5, 6, 15, 16, 25, and 26 above, and further in view of Lawler et al. (5,805,763, of record) [Lawler].

Regarding claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 29, and 30, Dunn, Abecassis, Sartain, Yurt, and Venkatraman disclose the systems, methods, and transmitters of claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 25, and 26, but fail to disclose a recorder connected to said receiver, wherein said distribution controller is further operable to include supplemental information in the answer e-mail message, the supplemental information including a control command for causing said recorder to record the requested program.

In an analogous art, Lawler teaches a video on demand service (col. 4, lines 23-29) wherein the service automatically instructs a recorder (fig. 2, VCR 23, col. 5, lines 43-45) to record a selected program (col. 11, lines 7-13) by transmitting a control command (record tag, col. 12, lines 58-61) to a receiver (fig. 2, interactive station control 18, col. 13 lines, 7-18) to cause said recorder connected said receiver [18] (col. 5, lines 38-45) to record said selected program (col. 13, lines 20-25) by attaching said control command to a notice of correspondence (col. 13, lines 15-18), allowing a user to quickly and easily record a selected program for later use (col. 13, lines 38-43).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the systems, methods, and transmitters disclosed by Dunn,

Abecassis, Sartain, Yurt, and Venkatraman to include transmitting to said receiver supplemental information including a control command to cause a recorder connected to said receiver to record said selected program by attaching said control command to a notice of correspondence [the answer e-mail message], as taught by Lawler, for the advantage of allowing a user to quickly and easily record a selected video on demand program for later use, as the user is relieved from having to manually set the recording parameters.

Regarding claims 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, and 47 Yurt additionally discloses supplemental information included in a system-generated confirmation of a user selection includes the time of the program and the price of the program (col. 13 line 55 – col. 14 line 12), further allowing a user to determine if the time of the program is convenient and the price is acceptable.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the systems, methods, and transmitters disclosed by Dunn, Abecassis, Sartain, Yurt, and Venkatraman to include in the supplemental information the time and price of the program, and taught by Yurt, for the benefit of allowing a user to determine if the time of the selected program is convenient and if the price is acceptable to the user.

16. Claims 34 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn, Abecassis, and Sartain as applied to claims 31 and 37 above, and further in view of Venkatraman.

Regarding claims 34 and 39, Dunn, Abecassis, and Sartain disclose the receiver and method of claims 31 and 37, but fail to disclose the controller in the receiver (Dunn, fig. 2, processor 62) is further operable to receive an answer e-mail message sent by the predetermined distribution unit (Dunn, fig. 1, headend 20) in response to the distribution request e-mail message, the answer e-mail message including a notice of correspondence when the user requested program is one of the stored plurality of programs.

In an analogous art, Venkatraman teaches the transmission of confirmation e-mails to users, confirming the selections made by users when interacting with a remote computer system (col. 6, lines 8-57), providing users with the opportunity to confirm selections made to reduce the chance of unwanted selections and providing users with the chance to revoke a selection.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the receiver and method disclosed by Dunn, Abecassis, and Sartain to include confirmation e-mails in response to user selections, as taught by Venkatraman, (when the program is one of the stored plurality of programs, as the correspondence is a selection confirmation) for the benefit of reduce the chance of unwanted program title selections and providing users with the chance to revoke a program title selection.

17. Claims 35 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn, Abecassis, Sartain, and Venkatraman as applied to claims 34 and 39 above, and further in view of Yurt.

Regarding claims 35 and 40, Dunn, Abecassis, Sartain, and Venkatraman disclose the receiver and method of claims 34 and 39, but fail to disclose said controller is further operable to transmit a confirmation e-mail message to the predetermined distribution unit when the answer e-mail message includes the notice of correspondence, the confirmation e-mail message indicating that the user of said receiver has agreed to purchase the requested program.

In an analogous art, Yurt teaches user confirmation of a purchase (fig. 3, step 3100, col. 14, lines 6-12) in response to a system-generated confirmation prompt (col. 13 line 55 – col. 14 line 12) to fully insure that a user selection is correct (col. 14, lines 2-5).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the receiver and method disclosed by Dunn, Abecassis, Sartain, and Venkatraman to include transmitting a user confirmation of a user selection in response to a system-generated confirmation prompt, as taught by Yurt, wherein the confirmation would take that form of an e-mail response, as this is the established means by which the transmitter and receiver communicate, for the benefit of fully insuring that a user requested program title has been correctly selected.

18. Claims 36 and 41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn, Abecassis, and Sartain as applied to claim 31 and 37 above, and further in view of Lawler.

Regarding claims 36 and 41, Dunn, Abecassis, and Sartain disclose the receiver and method of claims 31 and 37, but fail to disclose an answer e-mail message received by said controller includes supplemental information, the supplemental information including a control command for causing a recorder connected to said receiver to record the requested program.

In an analogous art, Lawler teaches a video on demand service (col. 4, lines 23-29) wherein the service automatically instructs a recorder (fig. 2, VCR 23, col. 5, lines 43-45) to record a selected program (col. 11, lines 7-13) by transmitting a control command (record tag, col. 12, lines 58-61) to a receiver (fig. 2, interactive station control 18, col. 13 lines, 7-18) to cause said recorder connected said receiver [18] (col. 5, lines 38-45) to record said selected program (col. 13, lines 20-25) by attaching said control command to a notice of correspondence (col. 13, lines 15-18), allowing a user to quickly and easily record a selected program for later use (col. 13, lines 38-43).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the receiver and method disclosed by Dunn, Abecassis, and Sartain to include transmitting to said receiver supplemental information including a control command to cause a recorder connected to said receiver to record said

Art Unit: 2611

selected program by attaching said control command to a notice of correspondence [the answer e-mail message], as taught by Lawler, for the advantage of allowing a user to quickly and easily record a selected video on demand program for later use, as the user is relieved from having to manually set the recording parameters.

19. Claims 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn, Abecassis, Sartain, and Lawler as applied to claims 36 and 41 above, and further in view of Yurt.

Regarding claims 48 and 49, Dunn, Abecassis, Sartain, and Lawler disclose the receiver and method of claims 36 and 41, but fail to disclose the supplemental information includes information consisting of the time of the program and the price of the program.

In an analogous art, Yurt teaches supplemental information included in a system-generated confirmation of a user selection includes the time of the program and the price of the program (col. 13 line 55 – col. 14 line 12), further allowing a user to determine if the time of the program is convenient and the price is acceptable.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the receiver and method disclosed by Dunn, Abecassis, Sartain, and Lawler to include in the supplemental information the time and price of the program, and taught by Yurt, for the benefit of allowing a user to determine

if the time of the selected program is convenient and if the price is acceptable to the user.

Response to Arguments

20. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2611

22. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) _____ - _____ on _____.
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dominic D Saltarelli whose telephone number is (703) 305-8660. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10-7.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on (703) 305-4755. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dominic Saltarelli
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2611

DS



CHRIS GRANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER